



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/366,429	08/02/1999	YEVGENIYA LYAPUSTINA	49986-018(RS)	3057

29989 7590 07/23/2003

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP
1600 WILLOW STREET
SAN JOSE, CA 95125

EXAMINER

VO, TED T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2122

DATE MAILED: 07/23/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicati n No.

09/366,429

Applicant(s)

LYAPUSTINA ET AL.

Examiner

Ted T. Vo

Art Unit

2122

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 August 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the communication filed on 08/02/1999.

Claims 1-19 are original claims. Claims 1-19 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brody, (US No.

5,495,613)

As per claim 1:

- Regarding claim limitation, *"A method for transforming character strings that are contained in a computer program, the method comprising the computer-implemented step of:*

identifying a hard coded string (figure 8a, block 800) that is contained in the computer program (see column 3, lines 40-52);

creating and storing an entry in a mapping that defines an association of the macro of the macro and the string (see column 4, lines 13-35) ; and

referencing the mapping in a program element that is associated with the computer program" (figure 4a),

Brody teaches a method for transforming commands (character string) in an editor (computer program).

The commands in the editor are built into the code of the editor. The method is based on finding a set of

Art Unit: 2122

commands that exists in the code of the editor (see column 3, lines 40-52). Then it creates the transforms, like macros, to extend the capability of the editor by supplementing available commands (see column 4, lines 13-35). The extension of commands is defined (mapping) in reference groups of the transforms. For example, a transform is performed on mapping between lowercase letters and uppercase letters (figure 4a), or on referencing "REPLACE" to "REP" (column 4, lines 45-50).

As per claim 2: Regarding the limitation of claim 2: Brody's editor is a software program that functions editing. Brody teaches parsing in figure 8a.

As per claim 3: Brody teaches inherently the claim limitation in the transforms of figure 8a. For example, if "REPLACE" was an identified string, then according to figure 8a, "REPLACE" is detected by the editor and replaced by "REP" (see step 804 "Is the Command A Transform?"). This means that if the detection finds the command "REP", it performs the normal macro.

As per claim 4: Regarding the limitation of claim 4, Brody teaches creating a file that contains transform code (See Building the Transform Library, column 7, stated at line 46).

As per claim 5: Regarding the limitation of claim 5, Brody teaches compilation since a macro or the editor is a program (see column 3, lines 40-53).

As per claim 6: Brody teaches inherently the claim limitation. In figure 9a, it shows the commands are parsed (see 908 'Parse rest of command'), and in figure 4a, it references string mapping such that an uppercase letter will be generated corresponding to a matching lowercase letter.

As per claims 7-8:

Regarding claims 7-8, the claim limitation has similar functionality as the limitation recited in the claim 1. The claims are rejected in the same reason set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 1.

As per claim 9:

Claim 9 is further limitation of claim 8. The claim limitation has the functionality corresponding to the functionality of claim 2. The claim is rejected in the same reason set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 2.

As per claim 10:

Art Unit: 2122

Claim 10 is further limitation of claim 8. The claim limitation has the functionality corresponding to the functionality of claim 3. The claim is rejected in the same reason set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 3.

As per claim 11:

Claim 11 is further limitation of claim 8. The claim limitation has the functionality corresponding to the functionality of claim 4. The claim is rejected in the same reason set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 4.

As per claim 12:

Claim 12 is further limitation of claim 8. The claim limitation has the functionality corresponding to the functionality of claim 5. The claim is rejected in the same reason set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 5.

As per claim 13:

Claim 13 is further limitation of claim 8. The claim limitation has the functionality corresponding to the functionality of claim 6. The claim is rejected in the same reason set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 6.

As per claim 14:

Regarding claim 14, the claim limitation has similar functionality as recited in the claim 1. The claims are rejected in the same reason set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 1.

As per claim 15:

Claim 15 is further limitation of claim 14. The claim limitation has the functionality corresponding to the functionality of claim 2. The claim is rejected in the same reason set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 2.

As per claim 16:

Claim 16 is further limitation of claim 14. The claim limitation has the functionality corresponding to the functionality of claim 3. The claim is rejected in the same reason set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 3.

As per claim 17:

Claim 17 is further limitation of claim 14. The claim limitation has the functionality corresponding to the functionality of claim 4. The claim is rejected in the same reason set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 4.

As per claim 18:

Claim 18 is further limitation of claim 14. The claim limitation has the functionality corresponding to the functionality of claim 5. The claim is rejected in the same reason set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 5.

As per claim 19:

Claim 19 is further limitation of claim 14. The claim limitation has the functionality corresponding to the functionality of claim 6. The claim is rejected in the same reason set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 6.

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Poirier et al., US No. 6,321,372.

Baker et al., US No. 5,511,159.

Fujihara, Mutsumi, US No. 5,778,371.

Wagner, "On the complexity of the Extended String-to-String Correction Problem", Proceedings of seventh annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing, pp: 218-223, May 1975.

Ogawa et al., "Simple word strings as compound keywords: an indexing and ranking method for Japanese texts", ACM, pp: 227-236, July 93.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ted T. Vo whose telephone number is (703) 308-9049. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM ET. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam, can be reached on (703) 305-4552.

Application/Control Number: 09/366,429
Art Unit: 2122

Page 6

The fax phone numbers for this Group are:

Official: (703) 746-7239;

After Final: (703) 746-7238;

Non-Official: (703) 746-7240.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



TUAN Q. DAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER

TTV
July 10, 2003